

# ANTIDOTE

TO THE

## POISON OF POPERY,

IN THE PUBLICATIONS OF

PROFESSOR SCHAFF.

First in his Essay and then in his History.

BY

J. J. JANEWAY, D. D.

NEW-BRUNSWICK, N. J.

PRESS OF J. TERHUNE AND SON, 31 ALBANY STREET.

1854.



---

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1884, by

J. TERHUNE & SON,

In the Clerk's Office of the U. S. Court, for the District of the  
State of New-Jersey.

---

#### ERRATA.

Page 18. Line 9 from the bottom, for "stumbleth" read *stumble*.

" 19. " 8 " " top, for "Notes," read *Note E*.

" 19 " 6 " " bottom, for "will" " *wilt*.



## INTRODUCTION.

---

In the Introduction, may, I think, with propriety, be stated particular facts, in regard to myself and my *contrast* that have induced me to prepare and publish this *Antidote to the poison of Popery* in Professor Schaff's publications.

Previously to the Professor's arrival in this country, Rev. Dr. Wolff of Easton, Penn., came to my house at two different times. The object of his visits was, by representing the favorable aspect of the German Reformed Church, to which he belonged, in regard to evangelical religion and correct church order, to solicit aid in their poverty. His representations induced me to promise to take the application into consideration.

A letter, dated Sept. 6, 1844, from the Cor. Sec. of the "Diagnothian Literary Society" of Marshall College, Mercersburg, Pa., was received, informing me that I had been unanimously elected an Honorary Member of the Society; and of the efforts made for the erection of a Hall for the use of the Society. I sent the young gentlemen ten dollars; and on the receipt of a second letter in 1846, ten dollars more.

Doctor Wolff wrote me a long letter, dated Easton, Oct. 24, 1844; in which he reminded me of my promise "to consider the claims of the Institutions at Mercersburg." He represented the College as doing well, with a large fund subscribed for its endowment; the students increasing in number and animated with a noble spirit; the faculty as able and efficient, of one heart and mind. Of Dr. Nevin and Dr. Schaff, he spoke in high terms. Wishing to help on the cause of truth and evangelical piety, I was induced, by these representations, to send a draft on the State Bank, N. B. for \$50, to be applied to the salary of Dr. Schaff. In a letter, dated Jan. 9, 1845, Dr. W. acknowledged, with thanks, the receipt of the draft, on the evening before.

Having read Dr. Schaff's Essay, in which he divulged his erroneous views, on the receipt of another letter from Mercersburg, I replied to this effect, "Young gentlemen, I fear you are under the conduct of bad leaders." Here terminated all correspondence with Mercersburg.

In the "Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review, for October 1852, was published an able article, entitled, "Remarks on the History, Structure, and Theories of the Apostles' Creed;" as a reply to articles in the "Mercersburg Review."

To the writer of the above article, I suggested how easily that most erroneous passage in Schaff's Essay, on pp. 137, 138, might be answered. He seemed unwilling to undertake it. I, therefore, determined to break off from my course of study, and engage in preparing for publication "a contrast be-



## INTRODUCTION.

tween the erroneous assertions of Professor Schaff, and the testimony of Credible Ecclesiastical Historians, &c." \*

Some pains were taken to circulate the Contrast among the German Reformed Churches. I sent a copy to the Rev. Dr. Wolff, and one to the Hon. James Buchanan, with whom I was personally acquainted, as coming from the author.

About the time of the publication of Schaff's history, it was intimated to me, that some one had told a wealthy and liberal gentleman of New York, that the extract in the Contrast was not Dr. Schaff's; and when the question was proposed to the gentleman, whom I afterwards met at Princeton; whether such a representation had been made to him, he answered in the affirmative. I then stated to him some of the facts recited above; and, without inquiring the name of the person making such a representation, I observed to him, that if he were to cast his eye over the first page of the Contrast, he would be convinced the extract belonged to Schaff; and added, I will hold him responsible for it. The object of this gross misrepresentation may be easily discerned, by any one who considers the *wealth and liberality* of the gentleman.

Copies of the history were soon seen by individuals living in New-Brunswick, who told me the *poison of Popery*, was artfully diffused through the volume. Going to New-York, the next Monday, I purchased a copy. On my return home, no long time was required to see what they had seen. On Tuesday, while examining the work, the publisher of the "Historical Commentaries of the state of Christianity during the first three hundred and twenty-five years from the Christian era, by Mosheim," came into my study, and offered it for sale. Coming, as it did, just at the time Dr. Schaff's history made its appearance, I could not hesitate to purchase it.

Looking among my papers, and finding I had written, nearly two years ago, a number of pages against the claims of the Romish Church, founded on the supposed Primacy of Peter among the Apostles, I saw it would not require much labor to prepare, in a reasonable time, an *Antidote* to Schaff's poison in a pamphlet form of moderate size; I determined to write one.

The plan for preparing this Antidote is:

- I. To expose the first *development* of Schaff's historical views, in the Extract that formed the basis of my "Contrast;"
- II. To exhibit the Scriptural argument against the Primacy of Peter, assumed by the Romish Church, in support of her unbounded and anti-christian usurpations; and
- III. To expose the second and very different, if not opposite, *development* of Schaff's historical views in his recent history.

\* The Contrast was favorably reviewed, in the Presbyterian Magazine, for Nov. 1852, p. 523; and a brief notice of it may be found in the Biblical Repository and "Princeton Review," (page 137, Jan. number.)

The Rev. Dr. Sprague of Albany wrote to the Author under date Jan. 24, 1853, thus:—"I was greatly interested in your homily written for the benefit of Dr. Kevin, and other travellers towards the dark ages. I wrote a brief notice of it for the Puritan Recorder."

## ANTIDOTE &c.

### CHAPTER I.

*The false claims of Prof. Schaff in favor of the Papacy, in the Middle Ages, exposed.*

Having carefully examined the English translation of Prof. Schaff's history, I proceed now to expose the *poison of Popery* apparent in his published views of history, since his residence in this country.

Let the reader, however, remember what is stated in the *Introduction*, that I am writing, not an extended review of his history, but only what may be comprised in a pamphlet.

The culling of flowers of rhetoric, beauties of style and sentiments, to be found in his history, I leave to others. My aim is at a more important object. I wish to guard such against a fatal sting that may be concealed in those flowers; and to beware lest, while they admire beauties of style, or even beauties of sentiment, they drink in the *poison of Popery*.

In exposing his views in the history, frequent occasions may offer to refer to my *contrast*; and as I intend to write remarks, which, in preparing it, were purposely avoided, in order to confront his erroneous assertions, not with my assertions, but with the testimony of credible historians; the *extract* from his Essay shall be reprinted here, for the accommodation of readers who do not possess a copy of the contrast. This will be done the more readily, that Prof. Schaff's own published views in his history, may be seen in a clearer light to be *entirely opposite*.

### "TITLE."

"THE PRINCIPLE OF PROTESTANTISM as related to the PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCH, by PHILIP SCHAFF, PH. D., Professor of Church History and Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary of the Ger. Ref. Church."



The pamphlet was translated from the German, with an INTRODUCTION, by JOHN W. NEVIN, D. D.

When the writer of the CONTRAST read this pamphlet, several years ago, he marked with double pencil lines in the margin, a long paragraph, on pp. 137 and 138. It surprised him that such a paragraph should be published by Professor SCHARF, and be endorsed by Professor NEVIN; both professing to be PROTESTANTS. The paragraph is this:

"Catholicism, particularly in its mediæval Romano-Germanic period, carried with it, if we put out of view its monastic institutions, a very distinct sense of the *nil humani a me alienum puto* as just described. It is this precisely which renders the Middle Ages so grand and venerable, that religion in this period appears the all-moving, all-ruling force, the centre around which all moral struggles and triumphs, all thought, poetry and action, are found to revolve. All sciences, and philosophy itself, the science of the sciences, were handmaids to theology, which based itself on the principle of Augustine, *Fides præcedit intellectum*. Before the pope, as the head and representative of Christendom, all states bowed themselves with reverent homage; and even the German emperor himself could not feel secure in his place, save as formally acknowledged by the chief bishop of the Church. Princes and people arose at his bidding, forsook country and friends, submitted to the most severe privations, to kneel at the Saviour's tomb and water it with thankful tears. According to the reigning idea, the State stood related to the Church like the moon to the sun, from which it borrows all its light. All forms of life, all national manners, were suffused with magic interest from the unseen world. The holy sacraments ran like threads of gold through the whole texture of life, in all its relations, from infancy to old age. The different arts vied with each other, in the service of the Church. The most magnificent and beautiful buildings of the period, are the cathedrals; these giant stone flowers, with their countless turrets, storming the heavens and bearing the soul on high, and their mysterious devotional gloom, visited never by the light of the natural day, but only by mystic irradiations poured through stained glass; domes, the authors of which stood so completely in the general life of the Church, and were so occupied only with the honor of God in their work, that with a divine carelessness they have left even their own names to perish in oblivion. The maxim was, Let the best house belong to the Lord. The richest paintings were madonnas and images of the saints, as produced by a FRA BEATO ANGELICO DA FIESOLE, a FRA BARTOLOMEO, a LEONARDO DA VINCI, a PERUGINO, a RAPHAEL, and a MICHAEL ANGELO. It was felt that the fairest among the sons of men, and the connections in which he stood, must furnish the most worthy material for the pencil. The most lofty and impressive music, according to Old Testament example, resounded in the public worship of God. Poetry sang her deepest and most tender strains to the Lord and his bride; and the greatest poet of the Middle Ages, DANTE, has left behind him in his "Divine Comedy" an image simply of the religious spirit and theological

wisdom of the age, as occupied with eternity itself and all its dread realities.— Truly a great time, and for one who is prepared to understand it, fraught with the richest spiritual interest. He that has no heart for the excellencies of this period; the beauty that belongs to the Middle Ages, must be wanting in genuine culture, or at least in all right historical feeling."

Does this contain historical truth? Was religion in such a desirable and flourishing state during the *middle ages*? Did true scriptural knowledge so prevail in the Church, and bring forth such rich fruits in the lives of professing Christians, as this statement imports? Was the government of the Church in relation to civil government, as it ought to be; and did it accord with the views and instructions of the great FOUNDER and HEAD of the Church, our LORD JESUS CHRIST?

So affirm Professors SCHARF and NEVIN.

Now, we do not intend to set up our affirmation in opposition to their affirmation. We merely design to set their confident statement in contrast with the testimony of CREDIBLE AND FAITHFUL ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORIANS.

As the author of the contrast adhered to his plan, as stated above, he will now take the liberty of making a few remarks on this singular extract from the publication of Dr. Schaff's views, in 1845.

But before I make the remarks, it is important to know the character of the man with whom we have to deal.

This we may learn from his own writings, and the pen of Dr. J. A. Alexander of Princeton.

In a note (p. 132) he quotes from an article written by Dr. A., in the "Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review," for January 1847, p. 105.

This note and the remarks we have to offer, will disclose Dr. S.'s character. When the reader has carefully examined his quotation, he will please to answer this question: What impression does the German Professor design to make on the mind of his readers? Does he not wish and intend, they should believe his views and the views of Dr. A. agree?

Had he enlarged his quotation, this erroneous impression would have been prevented, and his intention defeated.

I shall supply the deficiency. The limits of this pamphlet re-



strain me, or I should willingly transcribe the whole of a paragraph of which, in his quotation, he has not given *two* lines. I begin at the *ninth* line.

"Even the positive, dogmatical authoritative tone, which sometimes verges upon *flippancy*, may serve by rendering the composition more *piquant*, to make it more effective. Whether any good is likely to result, among intelligent and cultivated readers, from the author's habit of pronouncing just as confidently where he is imperfectly informed, as where he understands his subjects, from his supercilious representations of English and American Theology as wholly unproductive, or from the compassionate disdain with which he looks down upon all who are not of the High Dutch breed and breeding—is a question which we leave to be decided by himself."

In the next paragraph, Dr. A. writes thus:

"In some directions we are not prepared to take a step with him; in others we can go as far as he can; for example, in maintaining the importance of Historical Theology, as well for its *conservative* as its progressive influence. We hold as thoroughly as he can, the necessity of knowing what has been before us, in order to fulfill our own vocation."

Towards the close of the same paragraph, Dr. A. says:

"The changes rung upon this term (*developement*) and its correlatives have been so endless, that they seem to have lost all their power *ad captandum vulgus*. This would be a very insufficient reason for rejecting any real discovery which happens to be baptized by this familiar name: but when we look more narrowly at Dr. Schaff's principles, apart from the accompanying metaphors, they strike us very much like old acquaintances in *masquerade*, or we may even say like English and American travellers, fresh from the hands of a German tailor."

These paragraphs Dr. S. doubtless read, and read with no pleasant feelings. Here we see his character drawn by his own pen, and by the pen of one who had read his publications, and the writings of many a German author.

And what lesson should be taken from it? Clearly this: Not to rely on the simple assertion of Dr. S., however confidently uttered; nor to believe a thing to be true, merely because he affirms it; but

to demand proof—to scrutinize what he writes,—and to set him in opposition to himself, when he pens contradictory statements in the same volume: and to beware of his principles, disguised in *masquerade*, lest, on examination, they be found to be *strangers*, and not old acquaintances.

The utility of this rule will frequently appear in this pamphlet. It is no conjecture. I know what will follow. It is written already. A new order is now being made; together with such improvement as may be suggested by a review.

The writer is now prepared to make his intended remarks on the *very singular extract*, recited above, written by the pen of one calling himself a PROTESTANT!

In this Extract, with one exception, (*monastic institutions*), the state of the Roman Catholic Church, in the Middle Ages, when it was really in the worst and most corrupt state, is lauded to the skies; by a professed Protestant!

*Pascal*, a Roman Catholic, would not have written what this Protestant blushed not to write.

The Bishops and Priests of France, before the revolution, would have stigmatized this as *ultra montane*. They were jealous for Gallican liberty.

The all-grasping ambition of the Roman Pontiffs is justified:

"Before the Pope, as the head and representative of Christendom, all states bowed themselves with reverent homage." This is admired by him, although utterly inconsistent with the gospel rule!

"And even the German emperor himself could not feel himself secure in his place, save as formally acknowledged by the chief bishop of the church!" And why? because the emperor knew the holy bishop would excite his subjects to rebellion, if he did not do homage to this humble representative of Peter, "the fisherman of Galilee!"

All this was beautiful in the eyes of Prof. Schaff! And if the Pope could induce the U. S. A. thus to abase themselves to papal powers, would not this be a sight alike beautiful in the eyes of one who could pen the above extract!

"According to the reigning idea, the state stood related to the Church like the moon to the sun, from which it borrowed all its light!"



Men enlightened by the word and Spirit of God, look through eyes very different from the eyes of Schaff. They regard the Romish church in the Middle Ages, as a *dismal opaque body*, intercepting the rays of the Sun of righteousness; so as to prevent his light and heat, and fertilizing influence from reaching the true church and the earth. She chose to abandon them to darkness and ignorance, and coldness, and barrenness; to render them more submissive and pliant to her domineering will.

How beautiful the idea to this Professor, when he wrote, "The cathedral,"—visited never by the light of the natural day, but only by mystic irradiations poured through stained glass!"

Ah! if the sun could look into those Cathedrals "bearing the soul on high" by "their mysterious devotional gloom;" and see the worship paid to *Madonnas*, and to *Saints*, and to *Images*, instead of being offered to Jehovah and his Son Jesus Christ alone; would he not blush and hide his head, ashamed to witness these abominations of the Romish Church; which, she in violation of the first and second precept of the Decalogue, has set up in the house of God!

Yet, says this singular writer, "Truly a great time, and for one who is prepared to understand it, fraught with the richest spiritual interests. He that has no heart for the excellencies of this period, the beauty that belongs to the Middle Ages, must be wanting in genuine culture, or at least in all right feeling."

Excellencies and beauty of the Middle Ages! Alas! Popes were usurpers—the state of the Church was anti-christian,—ignorance and error everywhere prevailed, with their accompanying vices and licentiousness—Artists and Poets were not influenced by motives from above, or truly religious. In what, then, consisted the excellencies and beauties of the Middle Ages! They may please the morbid imagination of one whose mind has been perverted, by error, from the love of truth, and carried away by its delusions. But by a mind captivated by the love of religious truth, and under the sanctifying influence of the Spirit of God, no such excellencies and beauty, in the Middle Ages can be seen. It will turn away with disgust from this vain attempt of a Protestant to mislead them.

That a real Papist, so deluded as to believe the Pope, is divinely

entitled to occupy the exalted position as head of Christendom, which he claims,—that the Church ought to control the State,—and that the superstitious and idolatrous worship offered by Romanists, in their magnificent Cathedrals, is true and acceptable worship; that a man so deluded, might by the aid of a vivid imagination, see and admire the excellencies and beauty of the Middle Ages, is not surprising.

But that a professing Protestant, who knows the Popes to be usurpers, and admits the Romish Church to be corrupt in many doctrines and practices, should in the relative condition of the Church and State as here described, and in the worship offered in Cathedrals and "their mysterious devotional gloom;" see, and admire excellencies and beauty, and describe them, in glowing terms, that other Protestants may see and admire them; is what I cannot reconcile with truth and honesty.

Crossing the Niagara river, in 1828, just below the falls, with a lady, in a small boat, I bade her see the beauty and grandeur of the falls. Apprehensive of danger, she exclaimed, "Don't talk to me about beauty and grandeur now!"

A mind smitten with the love of truth and duty, while recollecting the abominations of Papacy, and the corrupt and idolatrous worship of the Romish Church, during the "Middle Ages," will turn away from the false description of beauty and excellencies, which the pen of *Schaff* has attempted to throw around them, to beguile the ignorant and unwary, with *disgust* and *loathing*.

The Doctor has read the story of the devils and the swine. (Math. viii. 20-34.) Art and design appear evident in the request of the devils.

Their design was, by destroying the swine in the sea, to operate on the depravity of the inhabitants of a city; to prejudice their minds against Jesus, and thus prevent their listening to his heavenly instructions.

Their plan succeeded. The whole city being informed of all that had happened, "came out to meet Jesus: and when they saw him, they besought him that he would depart out of their coasts." He complied with their request. As these foolish inhabitants of the city loved gain more than godliness, the Redeemer, who knew



the state of their hearts, as well as the design of the devils; was pleased to leave them to the working of the desires of their own carnal hearts; and to reap the consequences of their own sinful request, and preference of earthly to heavenly things.

Will the doctor try, by his vivid imagination and glowing rhetoric, how much *beauty* he can extract from this story, for his admirers?

Here we see the FIRST DEVELOPEMENT of the German Professor's historical views.

In his published history we shall see how greatly they are changed, and a developement very different and nearly opposite.

## CHAPTER II.

### *Scriptural argument against the claims of Romanists, for the Primacy of Peter.*

Romanists contend that Peter was the chief Apostle, the *Primate* or *Prince* in the Apostolic College.

In support of this assertion they urge as proof:

*First*, That Jesus Christ promised to build on him, the rock, his church; against which the gates of hell shall never prevail:

*Second*, That to him were given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the power of binding and loosing, both in heaven and on the earth. See Matt. xvi. 18-19.

But the claim to his primacy is *mere assumption*; and the proofs urged in its support are destitute of force.

Peter, it is cheerfully admitted, was highly honored by his Master, on two occasions:

1. He was selected with James and John, and conducted up into a high mountain, to witness our Redeemer's transfiguration; but Peter was not more highly honored than James or John; for they too were witnesses of the wonderful scene, and heard as well as Peter, the testimony which the Father bore to his Son. (See Matt. xvii. 1-8.)

2. Jesus selected Peter, and the two sons of Zebedee, to witness his agony in the garden of Gethsemane. In this honor James and John shared equally with Peter. But, on this occasion, Peter brought on himself especially a rebuke for sleeping. All indeed were criminals for sleeping, while their Master was overwhelmed with unutterable and mysterious agony; so that his soul was exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death. Had they felt that fervent love for Jesus which they ought to have felt, they would have watched one hour. The disciples when warned by their Master, "All ye shall be offended because of me this night;" Peter replied, "Though all men should be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended;" And when told that he would deny him thrice, he confidently affirmed, "Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee. Likewise said all the disciples."

Hence, when Jesus rebuked his three disciples for sleeping, he singled out Peter, saying: "Peter, what could ye not watch with me one hour?" Matt. xxvi. 31-46.

On these two occasions, it is manifest, that Peter had no preeminence in honor above his fellow disciples.

Peter was naturally warm, ardent, and zealous; but the warmth of his feelings, betrayed him sometimes into serious faults, and once brought on him a severe rebuke from his Master. "From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day."

"Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee Lord: This shall not be unto thee." What impertinence! What opposition to the appointment of infinite wisdom! No blind attachment to his Master could excuse such improper boldness. What followed? "But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence to me; for thou savourest not of the things that be of God, but of the things that be of men." Matt. xvi. 21-23.

How humiliating the rebuke!

This rebuke was followed by a statement of the terms of discipleship, and the glorious reward that awaited the faithful disciples. (vs. 24-28.)



Again: how faulty the conduct of Peter, the night in which our blessed Redeemer was betrayed and apprehended? Peter drew his sword, and without waiting for an answer to the question, "Lord, shall we smite with the sword? Smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear."—"But Jesus touched his ear, and healed him." (Luke xxii. 49-51. John xviii, 10.)

On that dreadful night all his disciples forsook him and fled; and Peter too, who had solemnly promised to be faithful, though at the cost of his life.

John soon recovered his courage, and followed the Band, who conducted the Redeemer to the palace of the high priest; and, although "known to the high priest, boldly went in with Jesus into the palace of the high priest."

Knowing that Peter was at the door, John went out, and spake to the damsel that kept the door, and had it opened for his admission. (John xviii, 15-16.)

The awful scene that followed, so degrading to Peter, whom Romanists and those who sympathize with them, pretend to be the Prince of the Apostles, is well known.

*Thrice* Peter denied his suffering Master; first, with a solemn declaration, "I know not what thou sayest." (Matt. xxvi. 70:) *second*, "he denied his Master with an oath, I do not know the man;" (verse 72:) *third*, when charged with being a disciple of Jesus, he began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man. And immediately the cock crew. ("verse 74.)

"And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter."

What a piercing look! It went to the heart of this apostate!

"Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said unto him, Before the cock crew, thou shalt deny me thrice."

"And Peter went out, and wept bitterly." (Luke xxii. 60-62.)

Behold in this degraded, though penitent apostate sinner, your pretended prince of the apostles, ye Romanists and sympathizers in Romish errors!

Compare him with *John*, that loving disciple, who boldly went into the high priest's palace, although known to him. He did not deny his Master. He outlived Peter; and was favored with most extraordinary revelations, for the benefit and consolation of the

Church. After Peter, penitent, and restored, and forgiven, had finished his course, and gone, with a crown of martyrdom to heaven; revelations (that imprint on *Rome*, on her forehead, the indelible and infamous stigma, recorded where it cannot be obliterated,) were given to John. (Rev. xvii. 5, 16.)

Compare Peter and John, in regard to love to Jesus, courage, and faithfulness in the service of their Master. Who should be esteemed first?

But Jesus would have no *prince* among his apostles, to exercise authority over them. (See Mark x, 42-45.)

Let us now examine the first argument by which Romanists endeavour to establish the princely authority of Peter.

They bring forward this portion of the word of God:

"When Jesus came into the coasts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?

"And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets.

"He saith unto them, But whom, say ye that I am?

"And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

"And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon, Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee; but my Father which is in heaven.

"And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

"And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt. xvi. 13-19.)

"This passage we distribute into three divisions; and shall consider

*First*, the confession of Peter;

*Second*, The promise relating to the building of the church;

*Third*, the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven.



I. We shall consider Peter's confession.

It was a noble confession. It came from above. He spake under the inspiration of God.

But alas! how ignorant was this prince of the apostles, as Romanists, not understanding the Scriptures, foolishly call him!

Let it be distinctly remarked, It is immediately after recorded in this chapter, that Peter acted so impertinently, and with such ignorance of the design of the Saviour's incarnation and mission into the world; a design on which his heart had been so set from the beginning, (Ps. xl. 7. Heb. x. 9,) as to bring upon him from his indulgent Master that severe indignant rebuke and reproachful name: "Get thee behind me" *Satan*; thou art an offence unto me." (vs. 22-23.)

This confession had, a year or more before, been made by Peter, in the name of his fellow disciples, although one proved to be a traitor.

"Then said Jesus to the twelve, Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall *we* go? thou hast the words of eternal life.

"And *we* believe and are sure, that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God. (John vi, 67-70.)

*Nathanael* made a like confession, at the very commencement of the Redeemer's ministry; and it stands recorded to his honor, by John, in the first chapter of his gospel; "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the king of Israel." (Chap. i. 49.)

Indeed we are taught by John, that it was the privilege and the happiness of all true believers to know the fundamental truth contained in this great confession; "The word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." (v. 14.)

From the above induction of recorded facts, it is manifest *Peter* was *neither the first to DISCOVER, nor the first to UTTER, this most interesting and all-important confession.*

II. We are to consider the meaning of our Lord, when He said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

That our Master intended by these words to teach us, that his church was indestructible, and would be sustained to the end of time, it is unnecessary to go into an argument to prove.

It has already been preserved, more than eighteen hundred years against assaults of every kind, by Jews and Gentiles, and preserved through persecution in every form; by imprisonment, by the sword, and by fire. Her members have been deprived of their goods, shut up in filthy dungeons, driven into the wilderness, or slain with the sword, or burnt at the stake.

By pretended followers of Christ, they have been dragooned into their corrupt faith, or banished, in multitudes, from their native country; they have been deprived of the Sacred Scriptures, which Jesus Christ commanded them to search, that they might find eternal life.

Pagan Rome has passed away, and Papal Rome is tottering on its base.

Still the Church of Christ lives, and will live, through whatever trials may await her in coming time, till her redemption draws nigh and she enters on her millenian rest.

But what did our Saviour mean? when he said, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church."

Here was doubtless a reference to what is written, (John i. 42,) where we are informed, that when *Andrew* brought his brother *Simon* to Jesus, he was addressed thus: "Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called *Cephas*, which is by interpretation, A stone."

But did our Lord intend, by his address to Peter, when he made his noble confession, to teach that the church was to be built on *Peter*, the rock? So say Papists.

Let it not be forgotten, that we have shown that Peter had before this made the same confession, in behalf of his fellow disciples, and that *Nathanael* had made the same confession, two years before.

To ascertain our Master's true meaning, let us endeavor to discover it, by the apostolic rule; comparing Scripture with Scripture.



Hear then the Prophet *Isaiah*, [xxviii. 16.] "Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste."

Hear the *Psalmist*, [cxviii. 22, 23.] "The stone which the builder's rejected is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes."

Hear Paul: [1 Cor. iii. 10, 11:] "As a wise master builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, *which is JESUS CHRIST*."

Hear Paul again: [Ephes. ii. 20-22:] "And are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and the Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone: in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."

Now, hear how Peter harmonises with *Isaiah*, and the *Psalmist*, and with Paul: [1 Pet. ii. 4-9:] "To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious, ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore also it is contained in the Scriptures, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him, shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumbleth at the word, being disobedient; whereunto also they were appointed. But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light."

Hear now the MASTER: [Mat. xxi. 42:] To the chief priests, and the elders, inquiring of him in the temple, by what authority he acted, among other things he said: "Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same

is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes."

Now, in view of these texts compared together, is it not apparent how untenable and unreasonable is the construction put by Romanists on our Saviour's address to Peter? when he said, "Thou art Peter; and on this rock, I will build my church."

By turning to Dr. Doddridge's paraphrase on Mat. xvi. page 484, vol. 1, Note, the reader may see by what a host of Protestant writers; such as *Grotius*, *Le Clerk*, *Dr. Whitby*, *Dr. Clark*, *L'Enfant*, *Bishop Burnet*, *Calvin*, *Dr. Barrow*, *Dr. Patrick*, &c.; the wild interpretation of *Romanists*, is rejected.

Doddridge too, and other writers, "look upon this as one of those scriptures, the sense of which might be most certainly fixed by the particular *tone of voice* and *gesture* with which it was spoken. If our Lord altered his accent, and laid his hand on his breast, it would shew that he spoke, not of the person, but of the *confession* of Peter, [as most *Protestant* writers have understood it,] and meant to point out himself as the *great Foundation*. But if he turned to the *other Apostles*, and pointed to *Peter*, he meant to intimate the honor he would do him, in making him an eminent support to his church."

This supposition, in the writer's view, will receive support by referring to John ii. 18-22.

Our Lord, in an early part of his ministry, indignant at the gross profanation of the temple, by converting it into a place of merchandise, having "made a scourge of small cords," expelled all out, who were thus profaning God's house of worship. Offended at his conduct, the Jews demanded of him a sign to prove he was duly commissioned to exercise the authority he assumed. He replied, "Destroy this temple, and in three days, I will raise it again."

Astonished at his declaration, the Jews exclaimed, "Forty and six years was this temple in building, and will thou rear it up in three days?"

The meaning put on our Saviour's words, by the Jews seemed natural; and it is probable his disciples also so understood him, by not attending properly, at the time, to the tone of voice or gesture used to convey his true meaning. But after his resurrection, by



recalling to mind, not only the words of Christ, but the attending circumstances, they apprehended, as the Evangelist says, "He spake of the temple his body," as the original may be rendered\* (according to Knapp's edition.) Unless something of this kind had occurred, how could John write? "When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said unto them."

### CHAPTER III.

*Same subject continued.*

III. The true meaning of the *keys* given to Peter, must now be determined. "I will give unto thee the *keys* of the kingdom of heaven, &c."

Where is the evidence for the interpretation of the Romanists to be found?

*Not in the first commission* given to the *twelve* to go and preach the gospel to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, in their cities and towns. The commission, with the accompanying directions, counsels, and exhortations, was given to the *twelve*, without distinction. (Matt. x.) All were authorized "to preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand." (v. 7.) All were empowered to work miracles. (v. 8.) If Peter is named first, it is because he was older than his brother Andrew, who went with him in executing the commission.

This commission seems to look to events that occurred, when they went to execute the commission given to them after our Lord's resurrection from the dead. (See vs. 16-23.)

*It is not to be found in the subsequent commission* given to the *eleven* by Christ, before his ascension into heaven.

That commission prefaced by these words: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth;" was addressed to the *eleven*. It

\*No Greek type in the office.

spread the world before them as the field of labor. It commanded them to evangelize all nations; to administer baptism; and to preach the gospel, by teaching them to observe all things whatsoever the Redeemer had commanded them. And it was followed by a promise of ample assistance and support, couched in words that extended the commission to all their successors in the ministry, through all successive ages: "And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." (Matt. xxviii. 18-20.)

Let the Master explain his own meaning. "At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?"

This question makes it evident that neither Peter nor the other disciples supposed, at this time, any *primacy* had been settled.

Hear what follows:

"And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily, I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven, &c. (Matt. xviii. 1-6.)

Again: In the same chapter, he said, "And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.

"Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven. (vs. 15-18.)

The same lesson is inculcated in the following passage. "And he came to Capernaum: and being in the house he asked them, What was it that ye disputed by the way? But they held their peace: for by the way they had disputed among themselves, who *should* be greatest. And he set down, and called the twelve, and saith unto them, "If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last, and servant of all. And he took a child, and set him in the midst of them; and when he had taken him in his arms, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me." (Mark ix. 33-37.)



In view of these passages where is Peter's *Primacy*?

Again: "Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children, with her sons, worshipping him, and desiring a certain thing of him. And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom. But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able. And he saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with; but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father. And when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren. But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; And whosoever will be chief among you let him be your servant; Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. (Matt. xx. 20-28.)

Where is the primacy?

In Mark x. 41, it is added: "And when the ten heard it, they began to be much displeased with James and John."

"But Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles, exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister. And whosoever of you will be chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." (Mark x. 42-45.)

Hear again the Master. "But be ye not called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even

Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant, And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." (Matt. xxiii. 8-12.)

Thus, while yet upon the earth, and before his death, he explained his own meaning, and taught us how to understand the words addressed to Peter, and through him to all his apostles.

In like manner did he address his disciples, when assembled with closed doors, for fear of the Jews. On the evening of the first day of the week, "came Jesus and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you. And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as the Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." (John xx. 19-23.)

Thomas, who had been absent from this meeting of the disciples, and was unbelieving when they told him, they had seen the Lord; being present when his Master appeared again to his disciples, eight days after, was addressed by him; and being fully convinced, exclaimed, "My Lord and my God." (vs. 26-29.)

So far it is plain the disciples had no knowledge of any thing like *primacy* being given to Peter; nor is their any scriptural evidence that Peter himself entertained any such impression on his mind; although, like his fellow apostles, while mistaking the nature of Christ's kingdom, he may have felt the working of unholy and carnal ambition of preeminence in authority.

And if our Lord had really settled the question, at so early a period as Romanists assume, would he not, when the question arose, at two different times afterwards among his disciples, have put an end to their disputes, by telling them he had assigned the *primacy* to Peter? But how differently did he treat their ambitious disputes! He told them plainly that the way to exalt themselves in his kingdom, was to humble themselves, after the example He their Lord and Master had set them.

In view of all these passages of Scripture compared together,



are we not taught, that our blessed Lord had not assigned any *primacy to Peter*, and that he had no design of giving such preeminence to any apostle?

#### CHAPTER IV.

*The Scriptural argument against Peter's primacy, confirmed by the case and testimony of PAUL.*

Let us now turn our attention to the case of the great apostle, and see what additional light can be fairly drawn from it against the assumption of Romanists, of *Peter's primacy*.

That Paul was a man of great genius, possessing mental endowments of high order; a mind diligently cultivated and enriched with stores of learning; that he sat at the feet of Gamaliel, a celebrated Jewish doctor, and profited in the Jews' religion above many his equals; is well known. In these respects he was far superior to Peter.

Peter had been highly honored in being chosen by our Lord as one of the twelve who attended on him during the whole of his ministry on earth, and enjoyed the benefit of his divine instructions. But Paul was honored with the appearance of our Lord from heaven, who threw around him a light brighter than that of the noon-day sun, and announced to him, that He had chosen him to be a minister to the Gentiles. "Whereupon, said he, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision: but shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance." (Acts xxvi. 13-20.)

Peter furnished two inspired epistles to the Canon of the Scripture; Paul, fourteen, constituting one-half or more of the New Testament.

Peter labored diligently and successfully among the Jews, being an apostle to the circumcision, and in some degree among the Gentiles. Paul's labors were far more and abundant and successful, and through a great region of country. "I will not dare," says this great man to the Romans, "to speak of those things which Christ hath not

wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ. Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation: but as it is written, To whom he was not spoken of, they shall see: and they that have not heard shall understand. For which cause also I have been much hindered from coming unto you. But now having no more place in these parts, and having a great desire these many years to come unto you; whensoever I take my journey into Spain, I will come unto you; for I trust to see you in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherwards by you, if first I be somewhat filled with your company," &c. Rom. xv. 18-33.

A signal honor was conferred on Paul, in which Peter never participated. "He was caught up to the third heaven;" whether in the body or out of the body he could not tell: "he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is unlawful for a man to utter." With what delicacy he touches this matter, speaking in the third person! (2 Cor. xii. 2-4.)

Does the reader wish to know more of this great apostle? He is referred to 2 Cor. xi. 13-33. Such was PAUL.

II. We assume it will be conceded by all fair reasoners, that if our Lord had really constituted Peter *Primate* or *Prince* of the apostolic College, the fact would have been made known to Paul, and acknowledged by him.

If, therefore, it can be proved that Paul, neither knew, nor acknowledged the fact, it will follow *conclusively*, that the pretensions of Romanists in regard to Peter's *primacy* must be destitute of truth.

This can be proved from the vindication of himself, in his epistle to the Galatians,—from the proceedings of the council at Jerusalem,—and from the vindication of his apostolical authority, in his second epistle to the Corinthians.

1. *From the vindication of himself in his epistle to the Galatians.*

To bring back that Church to the faith of the gospel, which he



had preached among them, and from which, through Judaizing teachers, they were in danger of falling, he makes this solemn declaration: "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me, is not after man. For I neither received it of man neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." (chap. i. 11, 12.)

In proof of this he states that as soon as God had revealed to him his Son Jesus Christ, he conferred not with flesh and blood; nor did he go up to Jerusalem to receive either instruction or authority; but commenced preaching the gospel at Damascus. He then went into Arabia, and returned to Damascus.

Three years elapsed before Paul went up to Jerusalem to visit Peter. He abode with him fifteen days. During his stay in that city, he saw no other apostle, but James the Lord's brother. To this he solemnly deposes. [vs. 15-20.]

"Afterwards, he says, I came into Syria and Cilicia; but was unknown by face unto the churches of Judea, which were in Christ: but they had heard only, That he which persecuted us, in times past, now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed. And they glorified God in me." [vs. 21-24.]

2. *From the proceedings of the council held at Jerusalem.* (Acts xv.)

It was fourteen years after his first visit to Peter mentioned above, that Paul went again to Jerusalem to attend that council to settle a most important question. It related to the circumcision of Gentile believers, and their obligation to observe the law of Moses. He knew they were under no obligation to keep that law, nor to be circumcised. So he taught wherever he preached the gospel; and when he and Barnabas, guided by revelation, went to Jerusalem, for the purpose of attending the council, they refused to allow Titus, a Greek, who accompanied them, to be circumcised, to gratify Jewish prejudices; and thus maintained the liberty which Christ had granted to his church, by freeing them from that heavy yoke that God had, for wise reasons, imposed on his ancient people. (Gal. ii. 1-5.)

As "they passed through Phenice and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles, they caused great joy to all the brethren." And when they reached Jerusalem, "they were received of

the church, and of the apostles and elders; and they declared all things that God had done with them." Acts xv. 2-4.

The apostles and elders being assembled in council to deliberate on the question submitted, and much disputing having occurred, Peter rose up and addressed the council thus: "Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us: And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that, through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we shall be saved, even as they. (vs. 7-11.)

Peter having taken his seat, "the multitude kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them." [v. 12.]

James who appeared to act as Moderator, then addressed the council; and, in the close of his address, gave his opinion what should be done. [See vs. 19-21.]

It was approved by the whole assembly; and chosen men of their own company were sent with Paul and Barnabas to Antioch; bearing letters in which they unanimously condemned the conduct of those Judaizing teachers, who had troubled the church at Antioch, and sustained the doctrine and practice of Paul and Barnabas.

The epistle being read to the church at Antioch, "they rejoiced for the consolation." [vs. 30, 31.]

In the proceedings of this council there is not the slightest appearance of any superiority of Peter in authority or honor; and Paul tells us, that he neither saw nor acknowledged any. See his statement of the result of the council, in Gal. ii. 6-10.

3. *From the vindication of his apostolic authority,* in his second epistle to the Corinthians.

Paul had been defamed and traduced, by false apostles, ministers of Satan, who endeavored to undermine and destroy his influence at Corinth; and thus to enable them, with greater facility, to accomplish their wicked design of subverting the truth of the gospel,



which he had so successfully preached in that opulent and luxurious city.

In these circumstances he felt it a duty to endeavor to counteract their sinister design, by vindicating and maintaining the authority he had received from the Lord Jesus Christ; who had commissioned him as his apostle to the Gentiles; and enabled him to be faithful in discharging his multiplied duties, and sustained him under his severe labors, and painful trials and sufferings.

The vindication of himself is commenced in the *tenth* chapter, and is carried on, through the following chapters, to the end of this epistle.

He speaks of the spiritual power imparted to him, for edification, and not for destruction, which he could exert, when present with the Corinthians, as well as in his letters, when absent;—of his rule to preach the gospel where it had not been preached, and not to build on another man's foundation;—of his success at Corinth, and of his anxiety, lest Satan, by the agency of false teachers, should corrupt their minds and draw them from the simplicity of the gospel of Christ;—of his labors among them, being free from any charge to them, and his determination to continue thus to labor in the regions of Achaia, to counteract the boasting of false teachers;—of his Hebrew descent;—of his abundant labors, great sufferings from stripes above measure, frequent imprisonment, and exposure to death;—of his manifold dangers, by land and water, from robbers, from his own countrymen, and the heathen, and false brethren;—and of his sufferings from weariness, watchings, hunger and thirst, frequent fastings, cold and nakedness;—and especially from incessant and daily care of all the churches.

He speaks of the abundant visions and revelations he had been favored with from the Lord;—of his rapture into the third heavens already noticed;—and of the thorn in the flesh, the messenger from Satan to buffet him, lest, through the abundant revelations, he should be exalted above measure.

Thrice, he says, he besought the Lord to remove this thorn; yet it was not taken away. But his gracious Lord granted what he prized more highly, His assurance: "My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness."

Fully confiding in the faithfulness of his Master, the apostle exclaimed: "Most gladly, therefore, will I glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me. Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong."

After this general sketch of Paul's vindication of his apostolical character, it is proper to quote, in his own words, two passages to prove that he felt himself to stand on ground of equality with any and every apostle.

In chapter xi. 5, he says, "For I suppose I was not a *whit* behind the very chiefest apostle."

And, in chapter xii, after having spoken of the abundant visions and revelations of the Lord to him, he says, (verse 11-19). "I am become a fool in glorying: ye have compelled me: for I ought to have been commended of you: for in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing. Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds. For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? Forgive me this wrong."

Now mark the love of this glorious apostle! "Behold, the third time I am coming to you; and I will not be burdensome to you: for I seek not your's but you: for the children ought not to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children. And I will very gladly spend and be spent for you: though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved."

What devotion to his Master's service! What love to the souls of men! What forgetfulness of himself, when fidelity to the honor of his apostolic office did not forbid it!

One incident in the history of this great apostle must not be omitted.

Subsequently to the delivery of the decree of the council at Jerusalem to the church in Antioch, Peter came down to that city. And while there, knowing the ceremonial law had lost its binding authority, and that Jewish believers might associate with Gentile christians, "he did eat with the Gentiles;" but when "certain came



from James," fearing to incur censure from those circumcised brethren, he withdrew and separated himself," and no longer ate with Gentile believers. The example became contagious. Other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation."

Paul felt his noble soul grieved at such unchristian conduct, so inconsistent with the recent decree of the council, and determined to maintain the liberty which Christ had bestowed on his Church. He was much younger in the apostleship and in age than Peter; but knowing his official authority from Christ to be entirely equal to that of his elder brother, he felt it to be his duty to do what he could, to arrest the growing evil. He determined, therefore to give Peter a public rebuke. Accordingly he embraced an opportunity for uttering "before them all" that faithful and pungent reproof, which is recorded, in Gal. ii. 14-21.

Here we might exult and say to Romanists and their sympathizers, Behold your ——! No; we would rather take a lesson on the weakness of human nature, though renewed by divine grace, when not upheld by continual supplies of heavenly influence: and suggest, that, probably in foresight of the great abuse that would be made of Peter's official character, for establishing claims so utterly opposite to scriptural truth, by "that man of sin" that would arise in the Church; and to furnish its friends with spiritual weapons, in contending "for the truth, once delivered to the saints:" his Master was pleased to leave him to himself, as He did once before, in a more humiliating manner.

And we would also admire that grace, by which Peter was again recovered from his scandalous declension.

He felt the truth uttered by Paul, and that his unchristian conduct and base dissimulation merited this public exposure. He, therefore, made no reply, humbly submitted to the chastisement administered, by the hand of his younger and more upright brother.

#### SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.

We have now proved, we think,

1. That Paul was, in genius, in natural endowments, and in education, far superior to Peter:

2. That the visions and revelations granted to Paul, were more than those vouchsafed to Peter:

3. That the inspired writings, which Paul contributed to the Canon of Sacred Scriptures, amounted to one-half of the New Testament; (if not more;) and were of course far greater than the two short epistles of Peter:

4. That in labors, in sufferings, in success in spreading the gospel, in consistency of character, and uniform uprightness of christian conduct, Paul far exceeded Peter:

5. That Paul asserted, *under inspiration*, his EQUALITY with the very chiefest apostle.

6. It, therefore follows, that, as he never acknowledged any inferiority to Peter, or to any other apostle, he certainly never knew his inferiority to any one; because, if his Lord and Master had made known to him the Primacy of Peter, he would readily have submitted to His will, and most cheerfully made it known.

In opposition to all this evidence against the assumption of the Romanists, no evidence can be produced, from Scripture, that any of the apostles acknowledged or even knew of Peter being advanced in authority above his fellow apostles; but additional evidence to the contrary can be produced; for it is written, "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John."

If Peter had been the *Prince* of the apostles, they might have requested Peter to go, but they could not, and would not, have SENT HIM.

Finally; What is the fair conclusion to be drawn from the preceding facts and reasoning?

Is it not this? There is no Scriptural evidence at all, that Peter was appointed by Christ *Prince, Primate* or *Chief* of his apostles, in honor and authority.

Any tradition, then, to the contrary, is *worthless*; and will receive His indignant and terrible rebuke, when He comes to purify His Church, from all errors in doctrine, and all assumption of anti-christian authority.



## CHAPTER V.

*The poison of Popery in Schaff's history exposed.*

Having in the preceding chapters exposed the *Poison of Popery*, in the Extract from Dr. Schaff's Essay,—and presented, at large, the *Scriptural argument* against the claims of the Romish church for Peter's *Primacy*, and proved them, as we think, to be groundless;—we proceed to expose the *poison of Popery* in his recently published history in the English language.

The poison of Popery will be seen clearly, by an attentive examination of a long note, compared with other parts of his history.

It begins near the middle of page 374, covers the two next pages and almost page 377.

A singular note indeed! containing contradictions, chronological errors,—misrepresentations,—artful arrangements,—unfounded facts,—bold assertions,—and sophistical reasoning!

In support of his favorite "*claims of the Papacy*," he says:

"These claims, however, by no means rest entirely on the memorable words of Matt. xvi. 18, which are now admitted by the best Protestant commentators (such as Dr. S. likes,) to refer to Peter, and upon the actual superiority of this apostle, as it appears clear as the sun in the gospel and in the first part of the Acts."

What a specimen of bold, dogmatic, and unfounded assertions, this rash man is accustomed to utter!

When he penned it, could Dr. S. have forgotten what he had written on p. 259, at the close of the first paragraph?

"Then again, from the conduct of Paul we may learn, not only the right and duty of combatting the errors of the most distinguished servants of Christ, but also the *equality* of the apostles, in opposition to an *undue exaltation* of Peter above his colleagues."

Can any one reconcile these statements? Are they not *really contradictory*? Can S. himself look at them, and not blush? Did he suppose that, by a bold assertion, he could conceal the contradiction, and escape detection.

The reader is referred to the Scriptural argument in our chapters

ii, iii, and iv.; where, we think it to be clearly proved, that Peter had no superiority assigned to him over the other apostles, by our Lord, and that Paul claimed rank equal to the *very chiefest* apostle.

What, then, is this bold assertion of this singular writer worth, in opposition to the testimony of Sacred Scripture; and even to his own declaration, made when reading the Scriptures, and reasoning on the rebuke, which Paul administered publicly to Peter, for his base dissimulation, at Antioch!

The subsequent parts of this long note is full of sophistic reasoning, artful arrangement, and unfounded representations; designed apparently to smooth the way for admissions, entirely opposite to his *glorification* of the Romish Church in the Middle Ages, in his Essay; but which he is *compelled* to make toward the close.

He says,

1. "The first assumption is," (i. e., "by Roman Catholic theologians,") that the primacy of Peter is *transferable*." How worthless this *assumption*! How could Peter transfer what he did not possess!

2. "The second assumption is, that Peter *did actually transfer* his primacy not to — but to the bishop of Rome."

This assumption must fall with the first. And here we might rest the question; but as Schaff is very desirous of upholding the Romish Church, I shall say a word or two. As to "the leading Protestant historians" of whom he speaks, who are not named by him, I make no inquiry; only observing that, from what has been seen of his habit of making hasty assertions, I do not credit his statement, because it is his; especially on account of the great inaccuracy into which he, in the next line, involves himself and the "leading Protestants" of whom he speaks: he says,

"Admitting that without such historical foundation the eighteen hundred years' history of the Papacy would be to us absolutely unaccountable."

What a blunder for a man who prides himself on his knowledge of history! Does he not know that, for *six centuries* at least, the Papacy had no existence? He says expressly,

"The PRIMITIVE or the GRAECO-LATIN, (Eastern and Western) UNIVERSAL CHURCH, from its foundation," embraced "the first *six centuries*." [p. 36.]

Surely he knows enough of arithmetic to be sure, that, if, from 1853, the year in which his history was published, 600 be deducted,



1800 years cannot remain for the *Papacy*. Was their no design in this misstatement?

"Paul dwelt (before his martyrdom) two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him; preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him." (Acts xviii. 30, 31.)

Where can a like scriptural testimony be found, in support of Peter's preaching in Rome?

It is doubted by historians whether Peter was ever in that city: and even Prof. S. after all his pains to prove that he was, is compelled to say, (p. 371 bottom.)

"We can hardly extend his sojourn there beyond a year."

And is it not probable, that he was carried a prisoner to Rome (if there) to suffer martyrdom? Yet Prof. S. strives with great earnestness to assist Roman Catholic writers in proving Peter the *apostle to the circumcision*, was bishop of Rome, at the very time Paul the *apostle of the Gentiles*, was preaching there in the *region divinely assigned to him*! Does not this carry absurdity on its face?

The next paragraph, having received an answer in what has been said already, is dismissed without further notice.

Then follows a long paragraph, containing a tissue of artful misrepresentations. He begins it thus:

"The ultra-Protestant view (so denominated by a *Semi-Papist*) decidedly repudiates the idea of the permanent primacy, and denies the papacy the least Scriptural ground or divine right, &c."

And will Schaff himself pretend the Papacy had any Scriptural ground for assuming "a supremacy of jurisdiction?" This he denies to it in the second and third line of the next paragraph, and reduces it to "*a primacy of honor and influence, (primus inter pares.)*"

Protestants and the Reformers of the sixteenth and subsequent centuries, regarded Popery as the "Man of Sin." "The Son of Perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God, &c.;" foretold by Paul as about to arise in the Church. (2 Thess. ii. 3-12.)

And for avowing this to be their belief, and that Popery was ANTI-CHRIST, they were slain and burnt at the stake,

But Dr. Schaff says,

"To this extreme view, however, we cannot at all agree;"

And then assigns his reasons.

"It not only turns all history before the Reformation into an inextricable labyrinth, but gives the lie to the Lord's precious promise to be and rule in his church continually—for it is an absolute impossibility to make out an unbroken perpetuity of Christianity without the Catholic Church—nay, it plays mightily in its results, without willing or knowing it, into the hands of skepticism and infidelity."

Here we see the *man*. How bold, and dogmatical, and artful! Certainly here the Doctor is pleading for the Papal Church; and this he calls "the Catholic Church." If this was not his meaning, why did he not inform the reader what he intended by the Catholic Church? He certainly knew that, for six hundred years at least, the Papal Church had no existence. During six centuries, there was no Pope; although aspiring bishops may have coveted to be exalted, as the head of Christendom. It cannot be doubted he had read of the Greek Church, of the African Church, of the British church, &c.

There was likewise in the vallies of Piedmont that noble Church of the Waldenses, which retired from the corruptions creeping into the Church of Rome, and which so soon began to bear its testimony against them; and when the Papacy came into existence, it protested firmly against its errors and its jurisdiction. This noble protest it maintained, through many centuries of persecution by fire and sword, down to the present day; holding a true faith and a scriptural form of ecclesiastical government.

But for this Church the Professor seems to have no love. As far as I can find he has entirely overlooked that people so signally honored by the Master.

How easily, could this historian, (had not his eyes been beclouded by his attachment to Popery,) have traced an unbroken perpetuity of Christianity through these different Churches; and discovered the fulfilment of "the Lord's precious promise to be and rule in his Church continually!" And, among these Churches,



scattered as they were over different parts of the world, he might have seen, for six hundred years, a *true visible, Catholic Church*.

"*Skepticism and Infidelity*," we affirm to be *genuine offspring*, not of the Catholic, but of the *Roman Catholic Church*. Had the Church of Rome, so highly praised by Paul (Rom. i. 8.) maintained her primitive purity of character, and not, by forgetting his solemn warning, (ch. xi. 17-21) become corrupt in doctrine, idolatrous in worship, and apostate, Europe would not have been filled with Skeptics and Infidels.

In the next sentence to the one on which we have made our remarks, the Professor says :

"No! In the face of a history of eighteen hundred years, during which the papacy has really evinced something of a *rock-like character*."

Here he repeats the blunder noted already. He certainly knew, that the papacy had not an existence for eighteen hundred years; and that, as it was not born till the seventh century, there must, in calculating its age, at present, be a large deduction.

What, then, is to be thought of the repetition of this blunder, a *second time*, on the *same page*! Does he calculate so much on our ignorance, (poor Americans!) as to imagine, that, by his art, and rhetoric, and dogmatism, he can make us believe a *FALSEHOOD* to be a *truth*; because a great *German* professor chooses to assert it once and again?

Had he stated the fact, and been inclined to use a fair comparison, he might have said; The history of nearly twelve hundred years proves the papacy to be like a *coral rock*, unseen at first, but constantly growing, till it became visible, and at last an immense and dreadful rock; against which, in a tempest, or at night, many a gallant ship has dashed and foundered and been lost. This would have been a fair comparison.

The comparison of Dr. Schaff emits somewhat of the odour of Popery. The advocates of the Romish Church boast of her antiquity. We, therefore, ask him who seems inclined to use this weapon in her defence, (even just before the acknowledgments he is about to make on his next page) whether length of time can change the nature of error and wickedness, so as to render the one *true* and the other *virtuous*, or, in other words, convert a *false* into a true religion, because it was originally divine?

Then may *Judaism* set up her claim; for doubtless she is a corruption of a religion truly divine; and she can trace her origin far beyond the Christian religion, up to the time of Abraham, the "*friend of God*." And she has evinced a *rock-like character*. The Jews have resisted all the attempts of the Romish Church to change their faith, and have, through the bitterest persecutions, for ages, retained the erroneous belief and customs of their fathers.

Nay, even *Gentilism* can boast of a higher claim; for Noah knew, professed, and taught his descendants a religion received from heaven. But they soon corrupted it, and fell into idolatry, like the Roman Catholics; and shall their polytheism, in all their detestable varieties, be admitted as a true religion; because they have, for so many ages, wandered farther from God and truth, till they have plunged themselves into the grossest errors and darkness, and the vilest abominations!

Just as the *Papacy* advanced in age, she advanced in error and superstition; till not a doctrine of Christianity escaped pollution from her defiled hands; and the pure and simple worship of God, instituted by Jesus Christ, was turned into the vilest idolatry! And does Dr. S. imagine he can save her from the condemnation she so richly deserves, by artfully speaking of her obstinate perseverance in error and wickedness, and by ascribing to her "*a rock-like character*."

Again he says:

"In view of the clear testimonies of almost all the Church fathers, &c."

Here again is a positive assertion, without proof, reaching to the time of Peter's death; as if the Roman see had commenced so early. To destroy the erroneous impression he aims at producing on the reader's mind, I shall present the testimony of *Mosheim* that profound and impartial historian.

"A bishop during the first and second century was a person who had the care of one Christian assembly, which, at that time, was, generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house. In this assembly he acted not so much with the authority of a *master*, as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful servant."

Where was "*the Roman See*," at this early period? The historian goes on to describe the conduct of a primitive bishop. And



then, in sect. xiii, he speaks of the origin of *dioceses* and of *chorepiscopi*, or city and country bishops. (vol. i. p. 104.)

In the next section [xiv.] he says:

"The Churches in those early times, were perfectly independent; none of them subject to foreign jurisdiction, but each one governed by its own laws and its own rulers."

After noticing the deference shown to the Churches founded by the apostles, and denying to them any "sort of supremacy over others," he adds:

"Nothing on the contrary, is more evident than the perfect equality that reigned in the primitive Churches," (Page 105.)

Again, What Dr. S. says, immediately after the lines we have just corrected, about "the consistency and tenacity with which the Catholic Church has at all times held fast the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, &c." is indeed true of the CATHOLIC, but *false* when affirmed of the *Roman Catholic Church*; which has corrupted more or less all the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, and substituted in place of that capital article, JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE, a most pernicious dogma, *justification by works and penance*.

This the Professor knows; and he also knows, that the apostate Church of Rome has dealt in that shameful traffic, *the sale of indulgences*; by which the forgiveness of sins committed, and permission to commit sins, might be purchased for stipulated *sums of money*.

And yet he attributes to this Church what belongs to the true Catholic Church; for he is pleading the cause of the Romish Church, or to say the least, he does not guard the reader against a wrong impression, as a fair and honest reasoner ought always to do.

## CHAPTER VI.

### *Merits of the Popes.*

Let us now examine what the learned Professor has to say "of the great merits of the Popes." Any one duly acquainted with ecclesiastical history, will be surprised at hearing these words, "the GREAT MERITS of the Popes!"

Dr. Schaff, however, is determined to be *impartial*, and attributes

"great merits even to the Popes." It is our privilege, however, to question his impartiality, by examining their merits, in several particulars.

I. *The popes maintained ORTHODOXY.* How astonishing this claim! The history of many centuries stamps on this claim FALSE.

II. "The Pope asserted the unity, freedom and independence of the Church against assaults of the secular power."

"The unity of the Church!" What kind of unity? The unity of *error*, by teaching the people to dishonor Jesus Christ, the alone Mediator, and confide in the mediation of departed saints, and of the virgin Mary. And by what means? By using their usurped power in depriving the people of the Bible, and compelling with fire and sword, all to believe their anti-christian dogmas, and to do what they commanded, whether right or wrong!

The Popes asserted "the *freedom and independence* of the Church against the assaults of the secular powers." Indeed!

Has the Professor never read the history of PEPIN, Mayor of the Palace of France; who dethroned his Master, and seated himself on the throne, with the concurrence of pope ZACHARY, who needed the protection of his arms? Has he not read that this impious decision of ZACHARY was solemnly confirmed by STEPHEN II, his successor on the papal throne, and how both were amply rewarded by PEPIN? Has he not read of CHALEMAGNE, that ambitious son of Pepin, who aspired "to the empire of the west and the government of Rome;" and who, by the concurrence of Popes, realized his lofty aspirations? Has he not read what great and ample rewards they received, both from the father and the son? Doubtless he has read this portion of history; and if he will read it again, as penned by Mosheim, he will, I think, find, in these transactions, no evidence that the Popes asserted the *independence* of the Church; though the Popes rejoiced in the secular donations they obtained; but abundant evidence of unchristian character and great ill desert. [See Mosheim vol. ii. pp. 222-230. Cent. viii.]

III. The Popes upheld "the *sanctity of marriage*!" Amazing assertion! In the face of all history, does Prof. S. make it!!!

Does he not know, that before the Papacy became established,



some of the primitive fathers, and particularly Jerome, extolled celibacy, in opposition to Scriptural teaching; and that the Popes soon began to require that bishops and priests should be unmarried men! And afterwards commanded those who were married to put away their wives.

He knows the history of HILDEBRAND, Pope GREGORY VII; how he exerted all his usurped power, as "head Christendom," against the marriage of ecclesiastics, and commanded bishops and priests to put away their lawful wives.

To refresh his memory in regard to the *chastity* of this Pope, I recommend to the Professor to reperuse what Mosheim says, [vol. ii. p. 485,] of

"His intimate familiarity with MATHILDA, the daughter of the duke of Tuscany, the most powerful and opulent princess in that country;" and what vast possessions and immense treasures, she at his persuasion, settled "on St. Peter and his pretended vicar."

Especially let him recall to mind the arrogant cruelty of this most ambitious Pontiff, towards HENRY of Germany; when he came across the Alps amidst the rigours of a severe winter, February 1077, and presented himself as a suppliant, "at the fortress of Canusium, where the sanctimonious pontiff resided at that time with the young MATHILDA, countess of Tuscany, the most powerful patroness of the church, and the most tender and affectionate of all the spiritual daughters of GREGORY." [vol. ii. p. 504.]

Here is a specimen of other Popes, to whom Schaff does not blush to ascribe *great merit* in upholding the sanctity of marriage!

#### DEVELOPMENT EXPOSED.

After the above review of what Prof. S. denominates *facts*, the *concessions* by unprejudiced Protestants of whom he speaks, are unworthy of any reply.

But the development of which he speaks in the next sentence, demands an exposure, on account of its falsehood, and the emphatic manner in which it is uttered. It is a climax to his pretended facts and sophistical reasoning.

*Development* is a new word that has come into fashionable use

with many; and is found neither in *Johnson* nor in *Walker*, though the verb *develope* from which it sprung, is. Webster defines development, "an unfolding—full exhibition."

According to this definition, development occurs in a flower, when it expands its leaves, and displays its beauties; but when it withers and dies, there is no development.

When the body of a child grows from year to year, in size and strength, till it reaches perfect manhood, there is development; but when the body sickens and dies, there is death, but no development.

When by the grace of God, David was converted, and advanced in sanctification and a holy life, for many years, till he obtained such eminence in the divine life, as to be an example worthy of all imitation; there was a bright development of divine grace; but when, by temptation, he fell into two most grievous sins, adultery and murder, by which he incurred the penalty of death; there was indeed an awful development of the power of indwelling sin, even in renewed persons, when not restrained by grace, that should keep us all sensible of our constant dependence on spiritual influence, watchful against temptation, and prayerful for divine aid; but there was no development of divine grace.

Truth can never be developed into *falsehood*: nor the *pure worship* of God, in VILE SUPERSTITION AND GROSS IDOLATRY.

Even Schaff himself, when he speaks of Peter's denying his Lord, and of his base dissimulation at Antioch, dares not call those sinful acts a development of divine grace. He traces them to a very different source. See how he characterizes them in his long note, beginning with these words, "(3) If Peter himself, &c." (17th line from bottom of page 376.)

What Prof. Schaff denominates "a development of Christianity itself," is, in fact, a development of fallen man's native depravity; of his enmity against the true doctrines of the gospel, and against the pure worship of God.

Hence it was, that professing Christians acted over again the part of heathen wise men, and received their punishment. (Rom. i.) "Professing themselves to be wise they became fools; and changed



the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man." (vs. 22, 23.) They "changed the truth of God into a lie." (v. 25.) And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind." [v. 28.]

#### SUCH IS POPERY.

Now, if this exposition of the word *development* is correct, then to talk of "the Roman church, however corrupt in many doctrines and practices," as belonging "to the historical development of Christianity itself, &c." is, to talk NONSENSE.

And thus, Dr. S., a *German Professor and historian*, who looks down upon us Americans, as if we understood neither theology, nor history, TALKS, and utters his language with *undoubting assurance*! Hear him:

"In view of all these facts—we cannot possibly question, that the Roman Church, however corrupt in many doctrines and practices, belongs to the historical development of Christianity itself, and that it must have also some ground even in the Holy Scriptures!" See his long note at the bottom of page 375 and top of 376.)

#### SCHAFF'S CONCESSIONS.

All these *unfounded* facts to which the learned Doctor refers; and the confident and singular language he utters; seem designed to prepare and smooth the way for concessions he is about to make; concessions entirely opposite to his language so glorifying to the corrupt Romish Church, in the *Middle Ages*, when it was reaching the climax of iniquity and usurpation; concessions extorted from him by circumstances, and yielded by him with a bad grace. (See Extract from his *Essay* in chap. i. pp. 5-7.)

Had he, like an honorable man, come forward, and confessed his errors, and not surrounded himself with the mist of unfounded facts and sophistical reasoning, we should have regarded his concessions in a very different light from what we do.

Our limits will not allow us to transcribe the whole of his concessions, some of which we should not be willing to accept; for example, to regard the Romish Church, although so exceedingly corrupt in doctrine, and guilty of having exchanged the pure wor-

ship of God for heathenish idolatry, as a part of his real church. We have room only for this quotation:

"From the purely spiritual authority of Peter, a fisherman of Galilee, who even when an apostle had no silver or gold, (Acts iii. 6,) who travelled from land to land, preaching the gospel, without the least ostentation, accompanied by his wife, (1 Cor. ix. 5,) who humbly called himself a "copresbyter," and emphatically warned his brethren against all tyranny over the conscience, and love of filthy lucre, (1 Pet. v. 1-3;) it is a vast stride to the temporal as well as spiritual dominion which the later medieval Popes exercised over all the Churches and States of western Christendom, distributing crowns and kingdoms, deposing princes, absolving the subjects from the oaths of allegiance, persecuting all dissenters, good and bad, ruling the conscience with the iron rod of despotism, and frequently perverting their unlimited power to their own selfish ends." [p. 376, line 19th, from the top.]

Is this a new discovery of the learned historian? Does it "belong to the historical development of Christianity itself, and afford a proof that the Romish Church has some ground in the Holy Scriptures?"

How different from the language of his unfortunate *Essay*, by which he, as well as Dr. Nevin, was teaching the German Reformed Church, and endeavoring to awaken her to a consciousness of being a *Melancthonian Church*; differing both from the Lutheran, on the one side, and the Calvinistic Church, on the other." [See note i. p. 133]

The reader may cast his eye over what follows the above quotation, in Schaff's concessions. But, in regard to wicked Popes, I prefer reciting the language of *Mosheim*. [vol. ii. p. 390.]

"The history of the Roman Pontiff's that lived in century, [tenths] is the history of so many monsters, and not of men, and exhibits a horrible, terrible series of the most flagitious, tremendous, and complicated crimes, as all writers even those of the Romish communion, *unanimously* confess."

Did not Dr. S. know this as well as what he acknowledges, at the close of his note, [p. 376,] in regard to the reformatory councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basil, &c.? How then could he write that most erroneous *Essay*? [See my *Contrast*.]

#### CONTRADICTS HIMSELF.

How contradictory these acknowledgments to his confident assertions in his own published *Essay*!



How shall this great revolution in his historical views be accounted for? He was familiar with Church history; he had read Mosheim and many German historians.

Were his views really changed? Then he should have confessed the fact.

Is it uncharitable to suppose, he began to discover he had gone too far, in extolling the Romish Church in the *Middle* or the *dark* Ages; that the American mind would not bear to have *darkness* called *light*, and *wicked* Popes honored as doing *right*; while usurping an unlimited dominion over Church and State, and compelling kings and emperors to do them homage, in order to feel secure on their thrones?

Perhaps an individual of great influence accelerated the change, by giving him a gentle hint on the subject; warning him of the consequences of adhering to his plan of representing the *Papacy*; that the praise was too gross and unfounded; that there were Americans acquainted with history as well as he; and that he must not calculate too much on American ignorance.

Were the Professor near me, I might whisper *confidentially* in his ear, and *perhaps correctly*, the name of the individual.

## CHAPTER VII.

### *Great error underlying his theory.*

In addition to the remarks already made on Schaff's extended note, we add, that what he says in the close of it, (p. 377,) about the Church of Rome inheriting "the prerogatives and gifts of Peter, &c." and about his being a *type* of one state of the Church,—Paul the type of another,—and John, of a third, still more perfect; is all visionary, destitute of any Scriptural authority,—a mere fanciful theory, indulged without due regard to the supreme authority of the inspired word of God.

Let the reader look at the two notes appended to page 133. There, as well as in the text, he will see how Schaff approves and endorses all the writings of Dr. Nevin; who, by his strange delusions,

has been already led, in heart to *Rome*; and who, if rumor speaks truly, will be there in person, in no distant day; though his friend, Dr. S. says, he cannot do so consistently,

"So long as he holds his theory of *development*, which makes room for different forms and phases of Christianity in the progressive march of the Church."

But if Dr. Nevin prefers the Roman Catholic phase of the Church, what then, Dr. S.? Can he not go to Rome, consistently according to his and *your* theory? And when Dr. S., feels the same preference, what is there in his views of truth and duty, to prevent his going also to his beloved Papacy? He has been pleading for it very earnestly and strangely; first by heaping on the Romish Church the most *unbounded* and *unfounded* praise; and, then, finding such lavish praise bestowed on her, when in her worst and most corrupt state, in the "Middle Ages," will not suit the American taste, retracing and making concessions, with an ill grace; but still pleading for her as a true Church, by artful and sophistical reasoning. When such a man shall feel a preference for the *Roman* phase of the Church, what will prevent his identifying himself with that *apostate* Church?

Now, when I consider all these things, and his insisting on the Romish Church, with all her corruptions in doctrine, her superstitious worship, and Pagan idolatry, being "a development of Christianity itself;" I am constrained to believe, that vile and *fundamentally erroneous dogma* of the Romish Church, which exalts *tradition* to an authority in determining our faith equal to the authority of the word of God, UNDERLIES his whole theory, as it does that of Dr. Nevin, in whom it is producing its legitimate effect.

Of what avail is the professed belief of the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, when connected with the belief of such a neutralizing and impious dogma? Its ruinous effects are seen in the history of the Romish Church. What said our Lord, referring to the hypocritical Jews, in the language of *Isaiah*: "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." (Matt. xv. 7-9.)



"THE BIBLE, THE BIBLE is the religion of Protestants."—*Chillingworth*.\*

*The writer's CONTRAST.*

To one other note, [as far back as page 92,] the reader's attention is requested. In that note this great German historian condescends even to notice the humble performance of the writer; and to save him from the reproach of ignorance, kindly withholds his name, while he sneers at *Mosheim*, and *Edgar*, on whom the writer relied as *credible* historians in opposition to the round and *false* assertions of the great Doctor; whose privilege it was to sit at the feet of *Neander*, as Saul did at the feet of *Gamaliel*. And he has become so wise as to correct his Master. See what he has written of *Neander* and himself, pp. 95, &c.

What compassion to conceal my name!

But alas! I appended it to the *Contrast*; so that I must bear the reproach in this country, as far as the *Contrast* may be known, notwithstanding the compassionate attempt of the Professor to conceal it, on account of my "age and ecclesiastical connexions."

But to be *serious*; let me tell Dr. S. I am not ashamed of the *Contrast*, humble as the performance is; and that he may publish it if he choose, even in *Germany*; for I feel assured, that every candid German would pronounce his unsupported assertions of no weight

---

\* From the character of Prof. S. and the art apparent in his long note, on which I have written my remarks, I felt persuaded this note was not to be found in the German edition of his history. After finishing my remarks, and not before, I wrote to Dr. Mesick, requesting him to inform me, whether the long note, [which I had described by the pages,] was in the German edition of S.'s history. After examination, he replied, under date March 14, 1854, describing the note, that it was not in the German edition.

Thus the concessions, which the Doctor, pressed by hard necessity, has so ungraciously yielded, are concealed from the German Reformed Church.

And is it not *curious*, that the recommendations recently published, in the *Presbyterian*, for the English edition, are all, with one exception, for the German edition, and so stated at the head of the advertisement? Had the gentlemen who gave the recommendations really examined the contents of the German edition? And are they willing to endorse them?

in the scales, when weighed against the historic testimony of *Mosheim*, and *Edgar*, with their authorities.

Hear how he himself praises *Mosheim*. [page 74.]

"He (i. e. CHR. E. WISEMANN,) was soon eclipsed, however, by the celebrated, JOHN LAWRENCE VON MOSHEIM, (1755) who holds the first place among the Church historians generally of the last century, and has acquired the honorable title of "father of church history."

And on page 73 he writes thus:

"The great effort now is to do justice to all parties; and there must certainly be admitted, in the works of a *Mosheim*, a *Schrockh*, and a *Walch*, an *impartiality*, which belongs to neither of the preceding schools.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

Corrupt in doctrine and idolatrous in worship as the Roman Church is, Dr. S. is by no means willing to admit her to be characterized, in 1 Thess. ii. 2-12, by the falling away or "the *apostasy*," and "that *man of sin*, the *son of perdition*; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." (vs. 3, 4.) Nor by that wicked, or *Lawless One*; (v. 8.) nor by *Anti-Christ* predicted in sundry places to appear "in the last time." (1 John ii. 18.)

No wonder; for his eyes are dimmed by his love of the Papacy—of her magnificent Cathedrals and splendid buildings,—of her charming poets and great painters; all animated by motives from above. And yet he has attempted to prove, that Peter wrote his first epistle from *Rome*, though he styles Rome *BABYLON*, just as John does in the Apocalypse. See pp. 363, 364 where he reasons on the subject, and tries to meet objections.

But others whose eyes are not beclouded by love for an *apostate* Church; that *Anti-Christ* that was to come into the world in the last time; can see what inspiration has imprinted on her forehead, in such large and legible characters: "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." (Rev. xvii. 5.)

And they can hear heaven's warning voice; "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." (Rev. xviii. 4.)



That the Papacy or Church of Rome, is designated by the predictions referred to has been proved by Protestants again and again. In this pamphlet it cannot be expected, I should even name the writers, much less that I should go into an argument on the subject. I shall only say, I have on my table a copy of a sermon delivered before the *Synod of the German Reformed Church*, in Philadelphia, October 18, 1853; repeated in the *Salem Church*, at Harrisburg, Pa., by REV. JOHN F. MESICK, D. D. Published by request. The subject, "The PAPACY, the ANTI-CHRIST. Text, 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.\*"

Had Prof. S. been present at his Synod, and his ear open to hear the truth, conviction might have reached his heart.

The *Romish Church*, the PAPACY is no part of the visible Church of Christ; and I will tell Prof. S. and others the reasons on which my belief is founded.

The chief reason is this; From the beginning of her existence, in the seventh century, the Papacy has been *tyrannical, persecuting, and idolatrous*; and became more and more so: till she has become *apostate*; a *synagogue of Satan, Anti-Christ*.

But have no pious individuals been found in the Romish Church? In the course of past ages, many. Now, alas! how few! since the warning voice of God has, for a long time, been calling them to come out of her.

The few that may still be found in that vast body, of error, sin, and pollution, spread over a great portion of Europe, and in other parts of the world, can no more change its true and odious character, so as to render it a part of Christ's visible Church; than a few particles of salt sprinkled over an immense mass of putrid matter, could save it from putrefaction; no more than rain falling on the mountains, can fertilize the great *Sahara desert* of Africa.

---

\*Appended to this sermon is a note, covering, in small type, more than half a page; designed by quotations from Dr. Nevin's publications, in the *Weekly Messenger*, Nov. 25, 1840, to prove, that his views in that year were Protestant and Anti-Popery, in a high degree. To satisfy the reader of this, it will be sufficient to transcribe only two lines and one word.

"Popery, says Dr. N. is at war with our government. If true to itself, it ought not to be trusted in the midst of our liberties and rights. If true to itself, it must be false to the freedom for which our fathers bled." p. 4.

The doom of the Papacy is recorded in Scripture; and no hope of salvation is held out to her.

One righteous man, Lot, could not, [though ten would,] save Sodom and Gomorrah from destruction, by a fiery tempest from heaven.

When Israel was cast out of God's sight, a promise of mercy was left on record. [See Hosea xiv.] When the Jews were destroyed as a nation, and scattered over the face of the earth, many promises of mercy, and predictions of their conversion and restoration to Palestine, were found both in the Old and in the New Testament.\*

In the *Apocalypse* the vile and hateful character of the Papacy is drawn by the pen of inspiration; but not one promise of mercy to her is to be found in any part of that Sacred book.

The *Roman Hierarchy* is the "woman whom John saw sitting on a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy,—having seven heads and ten horns." (Rev. xvii. 4, 8.)

The mystery at which the prophet marvelled was explained by the angel. (vs. 7-18.) The doom of the woman is denounced.—The ten horns of the beast, or the ten kings that gave their power to the beast, on which she sat in majesty, will eventually hate the whore, and make her desolate and naked, eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. (v. 16.)

The triple crown must be torn from the Pope's head; and this pretended vicar of Christ, who is worshipped as God, must be pros-

---

"From that singular sermon, preached by Dr. N., and printed in connexion with Prof. Schaff's Essay, in 1845, it is evident that he was already infected with the poison of Popery: (p. 197,) although he could not go with his teacher, so far as to believe the Pope was not Anti-Christ; for he expressly says: (p. 204 at the bottom.) "We do not suppose that the visible unity of the Church demands a single visible head, like the Pope of Rome, who is justly styled the Anti-Christ, for this very "pretension." To have agreed with his teacher entirely, in so short a time, would have been too rapid a change, and would have excited too much surprise.

At last, however, Dr. N. outstript his teacher in the race to Rome; the proper home of both.

\*See "Hope for the Jews," by the author.



trated in the dust. The beast and the false prophet must be cast into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." chap. xix. 20.)

The great city must be divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fall; and great Babylon must drink of the cup of the wine of the fierceness of God's wrath. Chap. xvi. 19. And this will not occur till the seventh angel shall pour out his vial into the air. (vs. 17, 18.) Alas! what judgments are indicated! Instead of repenting, men blaspheme God on account of his righteous judgments. (v. 21.)

The plagues that are to come on the Romish Church, designated the *earth*, are described. [Chap. xvi.] Five of "the vials of the wrath of God," have been poured out, or are pouring out. The *sixth* may have commenced its work on the great river *Euphrates*, and the way for the kings of the east, or from the rising of the sun, may be preparing. See vs. 2-17.

Some of our children may live to witness what is indicated in vs. 13, 14, but not the pouring out of the *seventh* vial, when the mystery of iniquity will speedily come to an end.

Should God be pleased to prolong his life and continue his intellectual powers, the public may hear again from the writer, on this interesting subject; interesting, because it relates to prospects before the church and the world, as held up to view in God's inspired word of prophecy.\*

\*The reader is requested, to observe and remember, that this Antidote is entirely independent of the review of Dr. S.'s history in the January number of the B. R. & P. Review. That Periodical did not come into my hand, till January 31st. Marking the time on the cover, I laid it down with the purpose not to read the review, until my pamphlet was completed. In accordance with this purpose, I did not begin the perusal till March 13th., when one form of eight pages had been printed off, and another was ready for the same operation.

Both reviews are entirely independent of each other.

April 1st., 1854.

P. S. Should another edition of this pamphlet be called for, the author will enlarge it, by publishing, in connexion with it, some of Schaff's notes; and thus save the trouble of referring to his bulky volume of 678 pages, and the expense of purchase, to those who do not wish to possess it.

J. J. J.

## NOTICES OF THE PRESS.

From the Albany Argus, March 23, 1854.

FOR SALE AT SEVERAL BOOKSTORES.

### "HOPE FOR THE JEWS."

By J. J. JANEWAY, D. D.

The venerable Dr. Janeway, now bordering upon eighty years of age, has in this little volume discussed a great subject, with great care and ability. He maintains that the Jews are not only to be converted to the Christian faith, but to return to the land of their fathers, and to be re-organized in a distinct, national capacity! The work shows a familiar and profound acquaintance with prophecy; and is so clear, consecutive and earnest, that it cannot fail to be read very extensively and with great profit. It is surely the production of a mind whose faculties have not yet begun to wane. W.

From the Christian Intelligencer, March 30, 1854.

"HOPE FOR THE JEWS." By J. J. JANEWAY, D. D. A 12mo. volume of nearly 250 pages. Published by J. Terhune & Son, New-Brunswick, N. J.

Some time since we referred to an ingenious little work of the Rev. Mr. Williamson, of Chester, N. J., the leading object of which was to show that the Jews as a distinct people are cast off, and no more to expect a national existence.

In the work before us, the venerable Dr. Janeway, in a spirit of deep earnestness, and with sound research, controverts, as we believe with entire success, Mr. Williamson's theory. He at the same time, takes occasion to go into an ample discussion of the covenant relation, actual condition, and future prospects of the Jewish people. The object of Dr. Janeway's work is to prove the perpetuity of the Abrahamic covenant, and that the Jews will yet be converted to the faith of Christ, and settled and re-organized as a nation in the land of Palestine. The subject is practical in its bearing, and the discussion of it is lucid, able, and interesting, and such as will well repay a careful perusal. K.